

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. By the amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 6, on page 2 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 00/49769 (Lecheler et al.). In numbered paragraph 15, on page 4 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) over Hewlett-Packard's commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,948,055 (Pulsipher et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed at least one collection computer relating to a management domain identifier. As exemplified in Fig. 1, one or more collection stations can be designated as a management domain (e.g., paragraph [0020]). Additional support for the recited management domain identifier and its trust flag may be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0031]-[0033].

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claims 1 and 8, which recite, among other features, information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier.

The Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or suggest information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

The Lecheler publication discloses a system directed to distinguishing duplicate network addresses in the customer domain using "Level 1" manager mapping tables. The Lecheler publication deals with a unique location identifier of the customer domain at the level one manager 34-38, but does not address unique identification with a management domain. Further, the Lecheler publication does not resolve unique identification within the management computer using a management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier. The Lecheler publication does not teach or suggest information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Co-Applicant Darren D. Smith of the present application is also a co-inventor of the Pulsipher patent. Applicants have disclosed in the present application (e.g., specification at paragraph [0027]) that data in the Pulsipher patent is represented in the form of structures referred to as topology objects. Applicants have further disclosed that in an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, "two additional fields, for example, can be added to the topology node object: a management domain identifier and a trust name flag." The Pulsipher patent does not teach or suggest information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier, as recited in claims 1 and 8.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further

distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

  
Reg. No. 32,858

Date: June 15, 2005

By: Patrick C. Keane  
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620